

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/668,523	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BENOIT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kishor Mayekar	<b>Art Unit</b> 1753	

**All Participants:**

(1) Kishor Mayekar.

(2) Matthew Koziarz.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 June 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1 and 31

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed with the Attorney that the recitation "including lens having a non-uniform thickness" in claim 1 as amended on 26 April 2007 could raise a rejection to the scope of the claim under 35 USC 112. The Attorney agrees to delete the recitation and added a limitation --wherein said non-reflective portion includes a thinner portion closer to the reflective portion and a thicker portion at a central point of the non-reflective portion-- by an examiner's amendment. The Attorney also agrees to include the cancellation of claim 31 since the claim does not include the limitation to distinguish from the prior art of record.